54

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/089,218	03/26/2002	Alex Ruelle	11345/047001	2586

22511   7590   05/19/2005

OSHA LIANG L.L.P.
1221 MCKINNEY STREET
SUITE 2800
HOUSTON, TX 77010

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, PHU K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2673	

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/089,218	RUELLE
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Phu K. Nguyen	2673	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _28 April 2005_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
   closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _22-26,61-67 and 126-149_ is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _22-26, 61-67, 126-149_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
      application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

PHU K. NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 2300

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _3/26/02_

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed
> or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the
> subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject
> matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made
> to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was
> made.

Claims 22-26, 61-67, 134-138, 140-141, 143, 145-149 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DREWS et al. (5,831,615).

As per claim 22, Drews teaches the claimed "method of drawing in a window, the

method comprising providing "a first mode in which a signal is sent following each

drawing operation instructing a client of a window which may be affected by the drawing

to redraw at least part of that window" (Drews, column 11, lines 32-63, column 12, lines

11-12; the application (i.e., clients); e.g., Clock application, Hand-Drawing application,

Annotation application, redraws its content in the transparent window when the

underlying window is inactive; the processor 1002 sends out the control signals for the

drawings of overlapped transparent windows). It is noted that Drews does not explicitly

teach "a second mode in which the sending of a signal is suppressed". However,

Drews' updating of re-drawn window is withheld a number of times (column 12, lines 12-

16, yielding the drawing of transparent window when the underlying window is active)

suggests the suppression of the signal to redraw the window depend upon the number

of withholds of update step. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure Drews' method as claimed because the suppression of the update signal improves the rendering speed in case of many updated applications through the skip of performing non-essential operation.

RESPONSE TO APPLICANT'S ARGUMENTS:

Applicant's arguments filed 3/9/2005 have been fully considered, but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

Applicant argues that Drews fails to disclose "sending a signal after each drawing operation" which Examiner disagrees. Each of the windows in Drews reference corresponds to a client running that window, and the client is notified to update the window only when an activate state. Therefore, in Drews, the client receives the update signal to redraw the window when in the active mode, and not receives the update signal when not in active mode. The yielding action of the processor in Drews is equivalent to the claimed signal: no yielding when update signal is sent and yielding when update signal is suppressed. Furthermore, although Applicant cites several features in the disclosure to argue the differences between the references and the claimed invention, these features are not incorporated into the claims. For example, Examiner agrees the argument about the specific feature "the signal is sent to effected clients after the completion of every specific number of drawing operations" which is allowable over the Drews reference (this feature is not presented in the pending claims).

Claim 23 adds into claim 22 "the signal is sent from a window manager" which

Drews teaches in column 4, lines 48-55; and column 12, lines 11-18 (e.g., processor

1002 acts as a window manager).

Claim 24 adds into claim 22 "the signal is sent from a client of a window

preferably sent by the client which carried out the drawing, and preferably sent to a

window manager" which Drews teaches in column 12, lines 11-18 (e.g., the instructions

for performing the update in the application windows, i.e., clients (annotation

application, hand-drawing application, ...).

Claim 25 adds into claim 23 "making information relating to the transparency the

window available to the window manager" which Drews teaches in column 12, lines 2-6

(e.g., the processor 1002 controls and monitors the rendering of transparency

windows).

Claim 26 adds into claim 25 "storing information as an attribute of the window"

which Drews teaches in the update of transparency windows (Memory 1008, column 8,

lines 55-65 and column 11, lines 41-59 – the attributes of windows are active status,

transparency/opaque of background, foreground, , ...).

Claim 137 adds into claim 25 "the sending of a signal is suppressed in dependence on the information" which Drews does not explicitly teach. However, Drews' updating of re-drawn window is withhold a number of times (column 12, lines 12-16, yielding the drawing of transparent window when the underlying window is active) suggests the suppression of the signal to redraw the window depend upon the number of withholds of update step. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure Drews' method as claimed because the suppression of the update signal improves the rendering speed in case of many updated applications through the skip of performing non-essential operation.

Claim 138 adds into claim 22 "defining the size of the window (Drews, column 9, lines 22-25); "arranging the background of the window" (Drews, column 8, lines 27-45; column 11, lines 55-58), and further comprising displaying a further window which has a background through which underlying objects are visible, wherein at least a part of the first window underlies the further window (Drews, figure 13, the further window 204 and the first window 202).

Claim 140 adds into claim 138 "means for identifying an area of the window affected by the change in the area underlying said window" (Drews, column 8, lines 17-22); means for identifying foreground objects in the affected area (Drews, column 8, lines 27-32); and means for redrawing at least part of the foreground objects in the

affected area after receiving a signal instructing a client of the window which may be
affected to redraw at least part of that window (Drews, column 8, lines 33-45; column
11, lines 32-63; the processor 1002 sends out the control signals for the drawings of
overlapped transparent windows).

Claim 143 adds into claim 138 "means for displaying a further window, which has
a background through which underlying objects are visible" (Drews, figure 10a, column
11, lines 52-55).

Claim 145 adds into claim 138 "means for monitoring drawing in a further window
so that drawing in the further window affecting said window can be corrected" (Drews
does not explicitly teach. However, Drews' edition of the annotation drawings (Drews,
column 10, lines 6-12; the drawing is recorded and later, erased partly or fully) suggests
the sending signal from the processor 1002 to correct the annotation drawing. Thus, it
would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention
was made to configure Drews' method by sending the correction control signal as
claimed because the sending edition signal from the central processor improves the
flexibility of the annotation drawing through the demonstration of correction the object's
lines.

Claim 147 adds into claim 145 "the signal is sent following each drawing
operation" which Drews teaches in the control signals associated with the processor
1002 (column 4, line 61 to column 5, line 1).

As per claim 61, Drews teaches the claimed receiver/decoder (Drews, Interface device for receiving/transmitting associated with the coded signals on network, column 5, lines 11-14) comprising "means for drawing in a window wherein in the first mode a signal is sent following each drawing operation instructing a client of a window which may be affected by the drawing to redraw at least part of that window" (Drews, column 11, lines 32-63, column 12, lines 11-12; the application (i.e., clients); e.g., Clock application, Hand-Drawing application, Annotation application, redraws its content in the transparent window when the underlying window is inactive; the processor 1002 sends out the control signals for the drawings of overlapped transparent windows). It is noted that Drews does not explicitly teach, "in the second mode the sending of a signal is suppressed". However, Drews' updating of re-drawn window is withhold a number of times (column 12, lines 12-16, yielding the drawing of transparent window when the underlying window is active) suggests the suppression of the signal to redraw the window depend upon the mode setting the number of withholds of update step. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure Drews' method as claimed because the suppression of the update signal improves the rendering speed in case of many updated applications through the skip of performing non-essential operation.

Claim 62 adds into claim 61 "the signal is sent from a window manager" which

Drews teaches in column 4, lines 48-55; and column 12, lines 11-18 (e.g., processor

1002 acts as a window manager).

Claim 63 adds into claim 61 "the signal is sent from a client of a window

preferably sent by the client which carried out the drawing, and preferably sent to a

window manager" which Drews teaches in column 12, lines 11-18 (e.g., the instructions

for performing the update in the windows).

Claim 64 adds into claim 62 "means for making information related to the

transparency of the window available to the window manager" which Drews teaches in

column 12, lines 2-6 (e.g., the processor 1002 controls and monitors the rendering of

transparency windows).

Claim 65 adds into claim 64 "means for storing the information as an attribute of

the window" which Drews teaches in the update of transparency windows (column 12,

lines 29 – the attributes of windows are active status, annotate windows, ...).

Claim 66 adds into claim 64 "means for sending the information to the window

manager, preferably in a message or via a function call" which Drews teaches in column

4, lines 48-55; and column 12, lines 11-18 (Memory 1008, and column 11, lines 41-59 –

the attributes of windows are active status, transparency/opaque of background,

foreground, ...).

Claim 67 adds into claim 64 "the sending of a signal is suppressed in

dependence on the information" which Drews does not explicitly teach. However,

Drews' updating of re-drawn window is withhold a number of times (column 12, lines 12-

16, yielding the drawing of transparent window when the underlying window is active)

suggests the suppression of the signal to redraw the window depend upon the number

of withholds of update step. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure Drews' method as

claimed because the suppression of the update signal improves the rendering speed in

case of many updated applications through the skip of performing non-essential

operation.

As per claim 134, Drews teaches the claimed "method of drawing in a window"

(Drews, column 9, lines 36-42) comprising "drawing in the window and monitoring the

drawing" (column 10, lines 6-12; the drawing is recorded and later, erased partly or

fully); determining a window which may be affected by the drawing (Drews, column 11,

lines 32-63, column 12, lines 11-12; the application (i.e., clients); e.g., Clock application,

Hand-Drawing application, Annotation application, redraws its content in the transparent

window when the underlying window is inactive); and "sending a signal instructing a

client of the window which may be affected to redraw at least part of that window"

(Drews, column 4, line 61 to column 5, line 1; the processor 1002 sends out the control signals for the drawings of overlapped transparent windows); the method being carried out by a receiver/decoder (Drews, Interface device for receiving/transmitting associated with the coded signals on network, column 5, lines 11-14). It is noted that Drews does not explicitly teach, "so that drawing affecting an overlaying window can be corrected". However, Drews' edition of the annotation drawings (Drews, column 10, lines 6-12; the drawing is recorded and later, erased partly or fully) suggests the sending signal from the processor 1002 to edit the annotation drawing. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure Drews' method as claimed because the sending edition signal from the central processor improves the flexibility of the annotation drawing through the demonstration of correction the object's lines.

Claim 135 adds into claim 134 "the signal is sent following each drawing operation" which Drews teaches in the control signals associated with the processor 1002 (column 4, line 61 to column 5, line 1).

Claim 136 adds into claim 135 "the sending of a signal is suppressed in dependence on the information" which Drews does not explicitly teach. However, Drews' updating of re-drawn window is withhold a number of times (column 12, lines 12-16, yielding the drawing of transparent window when the underlying window is active) suggests the suppression of the signal to redraw the window depend upon the number of withholds of update step. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure Drews' method as

claimed because the suppression of the update signal improves the rendering speed in

case of many updated applications through the skip of performing non-essential

operation.

As per claim 141, Drews teaches the claimed receiver/decoder (Drews, Interface

device for receiving/transmitting associated with the coded signals on network, column

5, lines 11-14) comprising "means for displaying a window on a screen wherein the

window has foreground objects and a background through which underlying objects are

visible" (Drews, column 11, lines 32-63, column 12, lines 11-12; the application (i.e.,

clients); e.g., Clock application, Hand-Drawing application, Annotation application,

redraws its content in the transparent window when the underlying window is inactive;

the processor 1002 sends out the control signals for the drawings of overlapped

transparent windows); means for determining that an area has changed (Drews, column

12, lines 26-29; the continuous changing of the clock hand); means for identifying an

area of the window affected by the change (Drews, column 11, lines 22-40); means for

identifying foreground objects in the affected area (Drews, column 12, lines 19-21); and

"means for redrawing at least the part of the foreground objects in the affected area

after receiving a signal instructing a client of the window which may be affected to

redraw at least part of that window" (Drews, column 11, lines 32-63, column 12, lines 11-12; the application (i.e., clients); e.g., Clock application, Hand-Drawing application, Annotation application, redraws its content in the transparent window when the underlying window is inactive; the processor 1002 sends out the control signals for the drawings of overlapped transparent windows). It is noted that Drews does not teach the changed area is "underlying the window" as claimed. However, Drews' object change affecting the transparent window and the underlaying window (Drews, column 11, line 66 to column 12, line 2; figure 13, the continuous changing of the clock hands) suggests the change of an area is either transparent window or the underlying window. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure Drews' system as claimed because modifying the change of the underlying window allows the user to monitor the change related to the underlying window beneath the transparent upper window.

As per claim 146, Drews teaches the claimed receiver/decoder (Drews, Interface device for receiving/transmitting associated with the coded signals on network, column 5, lines 11-14) comprising "means for drawing in a window" (Drews, column 9, lines 36-42) and further comprising "means for drawing in the window and monitoring the drawing" (column 10, lines 6-12; the drawing is recorded and later, erased partly or fully); means for determining a window which may be affected by the drawing (Drews, column 11, lines 32-63, column 12, lines 11-12; the application (i.e., clients); e.g., Clock application, Hand-Drawing application, Annotation application, redraws its content in the

transparent window when the underlying window is inactive); and "for sending a signal

instructing a client of the window which may be affected to redraw at least part of that

window" (Drews, column 4, line 61 to column 5, line 1; the processor 1002 sends out

the control signals for the drawings of overlapped transparent windows); the method

being carried out by a receiver/decoder (Drews, Interface device for

receiving/transmitting associated with the coded signals on network, column 5, lines 11-

14). It is noted that Drews does not explicitly teach, "so that drawing affecting an

overlaying window can be corrected". However, Drews' edition of the annotation

drawings (Drews, column 10, lines 6-12; the drawing is recorded and later, erased partly

or fully) suggests the sending signal from the processor 1002 to edit the annotation

drawing. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to configure Drews' method as claimed because the

sending edition signal from the central processor improves the flexibility of the

annotation drawing through the demonstration of correction the object's lines.

Claim 148 adds into claim 146 "means for suppressing the signal for at one

drawing operation" which Drews does not explicitly teach. However, Drews' updating of

re-drawn window is withhold a number of times (column 12, lines 12-16, yielding the

drawing of transparent window when the underlying window is active) suggests the

suppression of the signal to redraw the window depend upon the mode setting the

number of withholds of update step. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure Drews' method

as claimed because the suppression of the update signal improves the rendering speed

in case of many updated applications through the skip of performing non-essential

operation.

Claim 149 adds into claim 146 "means for defining the size of the window

(Drews, column 9, lines 22-25); "means for drawing foreground objects in the window"

(Drews, column 11, lines 41-44); "means for arranging the background of the window"

(Drews, column 8, lines 27-45; column 11, lines 55-58)), and further comprising means

for displaying a further window which has a background through which underlying

objects are visible, wherein at least a part of the first window underlies the further

window (Drews, figure 13, the further window 204 and the first window 202).

Claims 126-130, 131, 132, 133, 139, and 142 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over DREWS et al. (5,831,615) in view of Johnson et al.

(6,400,379).

As per claim 126, Drews teaches the claimed "method of displaying a window on

a screen wherein the window has a background through which underlying objects are

visible" (Drews, column 11, lines 50-58) comprising "determining whether an area

underlying the window has changed" (Drews, column 11, lines 32-63, column 12, lines

11-12; the application (i.e., clients); e.g., Clock application, Hand-Drawing application,

Annotation application, redraws its content in the transparent window when the

underlying window is inactive); and "if so, redrawing at least a part of the window, after

receiving a signal instructing a client of the window which may be affected to redraw at

least part of that window" (Drews, column 4, line 61 to column 5, line 1; the processor

1002 sends out the control signals for the drawings of overlapped transparent

windows); the method being carried out by a receiver/decoder (Drews, Interface device

for receiving/transmitting associated with the coded signals on network, column 5, lines

11-14).). It is noted that Drews does not teach the changed area is "underlying the

window" as claimed. However, Drews' object change affecting the transparent window

and the underlaying window (Drews, column 11, line 66 to column 12, line 2; figure 13,

the continuous changing of the clock hands) suggests the change of an area is either

transparent window or the underlying window. It would have been obvious to a person

of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure Drews' system

as claimed because modifying the change of the underlying window allows the user to

monitor the change related to the underlying window beneath the transparent upper

window. It is also noted that Drews does not teach "the receiver/decoder being for

use with a television set." Johnson teaches that the transparent window used in the

television set is well known in the art (Johnson, column 2, lines 15-19; column 4, lines

22-32). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made, in view of the teaching of Johnson, to configure Drews' method as

claimed because the use of transparent windows in the television set provides the user

a composite broadcast picture of image and annotated information (Johnson, column 2, lines 5-8).

Claim 127 adds" identifying an area of the window affected by the change in the area underlying said window" (Drews, column 12, lines 19-21) "identifying foreground objects in the affected area" (Drew, the underlaying window is inactive; column 11, lines 32-63, column 12, lines 11-12); and redrawing at least the part of the foreground objects in the affected area after receiving a signal instructing a client of the window which may be affected to redraw at least part of that window (Drews, column 11, lines 32-63, column 12, lines 11-12; the application (i.e., clients); e.g., Clock application, Hand-Drawing application, Annotation application, redraws its content in the transparent window when the underlying window is inactive; the processor 1002 sends out the control signals for the drawings of overlapped transparent windows).

Claim 129 adds into claim 127 "wherein after said redrawing step, said foreground objects obscure, at least in part, the area underlying the foreground objects" (Drews, column 11, lines 32-63, column 12, lines 11-12; the application (i.e., clients); e.g., Clock application, Hand-Drawing application, Annotation application, redraws its content in the transparent window when the underlying window is inactive)

Claim 131 adds into claim 126 "displaying a further window, which has a background through which underlying objects are visible" (Drews, figure 13, the further window 204 and the first window 202).

Claim 132 adds into claim 131 "at least part of the first window underlies the

further window" which Drews teaches in figure 13 which shows the overlaped windows

202 and 204 (Drews, column 12, lines 24-29).

Claim 133 adds into claim 126 "monitoring drawing in a further window so that

drawing in the further window affecting said window can be corrected" that Drews does

not explicitly teach, "so that drawing affecting an overlaying window can be corrected".

However, Drews' edition of the annotation drawings (Drews, column 10, lines 6-12; the

drawing is recorded and later, erased partly or fully) suggests the sending signal from

the processor 1002 to edit the annotation drawing. Thus, it would have been obvious to

a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure

Drews' method as claimed because the sending edition signal from the central

processor improves the flexibility of the annotation drawing through the demonstration

of correction the object's lines.

As per claim 128, Drews teaches the claimed "method of displaying a window on

a screen, wherein the window has foreground objects and a background through which

underlying objects are visible" (Drews, column 11, lines 32-63, column 12, lines 11-12;

the application (i.e., clients); e.g., Clock application, Hand-Drawing application,

Annotation application, redraws its content in the transparent window when the

underlying window is inactive; the processor 1002 sends out the control signals for the

drawings of overlapped transparent windows); comprising the steps of: determining that

an area has changed (Drews, column 12, lines 26-29; the continuous changing of the

clock hand); identifying an area of the window affected by the change (Drews, column

11, lines 22-40); identifying foreground objects in the affected area (Drews, column 12,

lines 19-21); and "redrawing at least the part of the foreground objects in the affected

area after receiving a signal instructing a client of the window which may be affected to

redraw at least part of that window" (Drews, column 11, lines 32-63, column 12, lines

11-12; the application (i.e., clients); e.g., Clock application, Hand-Drawing application,

Annotation application, redraws its content in the transparent window when the

underlying window is inactive; the processor 1002 sends out the control signals for the

drawings of overlapped transparent windows); and the method being carried out by a

receiver/decoder (Drews, Interface device for receiving/transmitting associated with the

coded signals on network, column 5, lines 11-14). It is noted that Drews does not teach

the changed area is "underlying the window" as claimed. However, Drews' object

change affecting the transparent window and the underlaying window (Drews, column

11, line 66 to column 12, line 2; figure 13, the continuous changing of the clock hands)

suggests the change of an area is either transparent window or the underlying window.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to configure Drews' system as claimed because modifying the

change of the underlying window allows the user to monitor the change related to the

underlying window beneath the transparent upper window. It is also noted that Drews

does not teach "the receiver/decoder being for use with a television set." Johnson

teaches that the transparent window used in the television set is well known in the art

(Johnson, column 2, lines 15-19; column 4, lines 22-32). It would have been obvious to

a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, in view of the

teaching of Johnson, to configure Drews' method as claimed because the use of

transparent windows in the television set provides the user a composite broadcast

picture of image and annotated information (Johnson, column 2, lines 5-8).

Claim 130 adds into claim 128 "after said redrawing step, said foreground objects

obscure, at least in part, the area underlying the foreground objects" which Drews

teaches in figure 10a (Drews, column 11, lines 41-49; the foreground of the transparent

window obscures all the objects on the underlying window).

As per claim 139, Drews teaches the claimed receiver/decoder (Drews, Interface

device for receiving/transmitting associated with the coded signals on network, column

5, lines 11-14) comprising "means for displaying a window on a screen wherein the

window has foreground objects and a background through which underlying objects are

visible" (Drews, column 11, lines 32-63, column 12, lines 11-12; the application (i.e.,

clients); e.g., Clock application, Hand-Drawing application, Annotation application,

redraws its content in the transparent window when the underlying window is inactive;

the processor 1002 sends out the control signals for the drawings of overlapped

transparent windows); means for determining that an area has changed (Drews, column

12, lines 26-29; the continuous changing of the clock hand); and "means for redrawing

at least the part of the foreground objects in the affected area after receiving a signal

instructing a client of the window which may be affected to redraw at least part of that

window" (Drews, column 11, lines 32-63, column 12, lines 11-12; the application (i.e.,

clients); e.g., Clock application, Hand-Drawing application, Annotation application,

redraws its content in the transparent window when the underlying window is inactive;

the processor 1002 sends out the control signals for the drawings of overlapped

transparent windows and the method being carried out by a receiver/decoder (Drews,

Interface device for receiving/transmitting associated with the coded signals on network,

column 5, lines 11-14). It is noted that Drews does not teach the changed area is

"underlying the window" as claimed. However, Drews' object change affecting the

transparent window and the underlying window (Drews, column 11, line 66 to column

12, line 2; figure 13, the continuous changing of the clock hands) suggests the change

of an area is either transparent window or the underlying window. It would have been

obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

configure Drews' system as claimed because modifying the change of the underlying

window allows the user to monitor the change related to the underlying window beneath

the transparent upper window. It is also noted that Drews does not teach "the

receiver/decoder being for use with a television set." Johnson teaches that the

transparent window used in the television set is well known in the art (Johnson, column

2, lines 15-19; column 4, lines 22-32). It would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, in view of the teaching of

Johnson, to configure Drews' method as claimed because the use of transparent

windows in the television set provides the user a composite broadcast picture of image

and annotated information (Johnson, column 2, lines 5-8).

Claim 142 adds into claim 139 "as a result of the operation of said redrawing

means, said foreground objects obscure, at least in part, the area underlying the

foreground objects" which Drews teaches in figure 10a (Drews, column 11, lines 41-49;

the foreground of the transparent window obscures all the objects on the underlying

window).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Phu K. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272

7645. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, bipin Shalwala can be reached on (571) 272 7681. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Phu K. Nguyen
May 16, 2005

PHU K. NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 2300